

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The present amendment is in response to the final Office Action mailed April 3, 2003, in which Claims 1 through 15 were rejected. Applicant has thoroughly reviewed the outstanding Office Action including the Examiner's remarks and the reference cited therein. The following remarks are believed to be fully responsive to the Office Action and, when coupled with the amendments made herein, are believed to render all claims at issue patentably distinguishable over the cited references.

Claims 1, 3 and 15 are amended herein. Claim 2 is cancelled. No claims are added. Accordingly, Claims 1 and 3 through 15 remain pending.

All the changes are made for clarification and are based on the application and drawings as originally filed. It is respectfully submitted that no new matter is added.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration in light of the above amendments and the following remarks.

### **CLAIM REJECTIONS ï 35 U.S.C. SECTION 103(a)**

#### **A. Claims 1 through 12**

With respect to pages 2 and 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1 through 12 under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 2,724,465 to Krauss *et al.* (hereinafter known as "Krauss *et al.*") in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,506,482 to Pracht *et al.* (hereinafter known as "Pracht *et al.*").

Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Independent Claim 1 has been amended for clarification to define the frame as having rearwardly angled edges relative to the front surface of the frame, based upon now-cancelled dependent Claim 2. The Examiner rejected Claim 2 on the grounds that "Krauss discloses the panel as having an edge with angles (fig. 6: 42)." However, element 42 of Krauss is an insulating body. Certainly Krauss has frame members ("U") which have angles going in a plurality of directions, but Krauss fails to disclose, suggest, or otherwise render obvious the frame as defined in amended Figure 1. In fact, the multi-angled, complex configuration of Krauss is just the sort of configuration that is known in the art. It is this complex, difficult to manufacture and expensive to install arrangement that the present invention is designed to avoid. Krauss does not represent a solution in the prior art, instead it underscores the problem in the prior art and, in fact, teaches *away* from the present invention.

Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 1 as currently written overcomes the Examiner's rejection under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a). Insofar as Claims 3 through 12 are dependent either directly or indirectly on Claim 1, Applicant also respectfully that these claims are allowable over the art of record as well.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) with respect to Claims 1 and 3 through 12 are respectfully requested.

## B. Claims 13 and 14

With respect to pages 3 and 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 13 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,045,933 to Grillo (hereinafter known as "Grillo") in view of Pracht *et al.*

Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Independent Claim 13 has been amended for clarification to define the frame in greater detail. This arrangement is not taught, suggested, nor otherwise made obvious in Grillo in view of Pracht *et al.*

Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 13 as currently written overcomes the Examiner's rejection under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a). Insofar as Claim 14 is dependent directly on Claim 13, Applicant also respectfully that this claim is allowable over the art of record as well.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) with respect to Claims 13 and 14 are respectfully requested.

### C. Claim 15

With respect to page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,782,636 to Stoakes (hereinafter known as "Stoakes") in view of Pracht *et al.*

Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Independent Claim 15 has been amended for clarification to define the frame in greater detail. This arrangement is not taught, suggested, nor otherwise made obvious in Stoakes in view of Pracht *et al.*

Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 15 as currently written overcomes the Examiner's rejection under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a).

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) with respect to Claim 15 are respectfully requested.

## **ENTRY OF AMENDMENT AFTER FINAL**

It is respectfully submitted that the present amendment should be entered in accordance with the provisions of 37 C.F.R. Section 1.116 on the grounds that: (1) The claims as now presented are in better form for appeal purposes, if necessary; (2) no new issues have been raised; (3) and, moreover, the present amendment is believed to place the application in condition for allowance.

## **CONCLUSION**

In light of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims as currently presented are in condition for allowance. If, for any reason, the Examiner disagrees, please call the undersigned attorney at 248-433-7552 in an effort to resolve any matter still outstanding *before* issuing another action. The undersigned attorney is confident that any issue which might remain can readily be worked out by telephone.

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,



Thomas T. Moga  
Registration No. 34,881  
Attorney for Applicant

DICKINSON WRIGHT PLLC  
1901 L Street, N.W., Suite 800  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
202-457-0160

Dated: October 3, 2003

TTM/hs